

BACONIANA.

VOL. III. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1905.

No. 10.

ERRORS AND ANACHRONISMS.

AMONG the numerous mistakes which Bacon has made in his classical quotations, caused by his habit of trusting to his memory without "verifying his references" (one of the most important principles of literary conduct), there is a very remarkable instance, which I do not remember ever to have seen criticised. It occurs in the Sixth book of the *De Augmentis*, chap. IV., and is thus translated by Spedding:—"It will not be amiss to observe, also, that even mean faculties, when they fall into great men or great matters, sometimes work great and important effects. Of this I will adduce a memorable example, the rather because the Jesuits appear not to despise this kind of discipline; therein judging (as I think) well. It is a thing, indeed, if practised professionally, of low repute; but if it be made a part of discipline it is of excellent use. I mean stage-playing—an art which strengthens the memory, regulates the tone and effect of the voice and pronunciation, teaches a decent carriage of the countenance and gesture, gives not a little assurance, and accustoms young men to bear being looked at. The example which I shall give, taken from Tacitus, is that of one Vibulenus, formerly an actor, then a soldier in the Pannonian legions. This man had, at the death

of Augustus, raised a mutiny, whereupon Blæsus, the lieutenant, committed some of the mutineers to prison. The soldiers, however, broke in and let them out; whereupon Vibulenus, getting up to speak, began thus: 'These poor innocent wretches you have restored to light and life; but who shall restore life to my brother, or my brother to me? whom being sent in message from the legions of Germany to treat of the common cause, this man has murdered last night by some of his swordsmen, whom he keeps and arms for the execution of soldiers. Answer, Blæsus, where have you thrown his body? Enemies themselves deny not burial. When with kisses and tears I shall have satiated my grief, command me also to be slain beside him; only let these, my fellows, seeing we are put to death for no crime, but because we consulted for the good of the legions, have leave to bury us.' With which words he excited such excessive jealousy and alarm that, had it not shortly afterwards appeared that nothing of the sort had happened—nay, that he had never had a brother—the soldiers would hardly have kept their hands off the Prefect; but the fact was that he played the whole thing as if it had been a piece on the stage" (Works, IV., p. 496.)

Tacitus nowhere says that Vibulenus was, or had been, an actor. This is all that he says of his antecedents: "*Vibulenus quidam gregarius miles*, one Vibulenus, a common soldier," and then he gives the speech and its tremendous effect on the mutineers (Annals, I., 22, 23). He concludes the whole incident thus:—"Had it not been quickly ascertained that no corpse was found and that the slaves under torture had denied the execution, and that he never had a brother, they would have gone near murdering the legate."

Bacon confounded Vibulenus with another ring-leader, named Percennius, of whom Tacitus says, in

chap. XVI.:—" *Erat in castris Percennius quidam, dux olim theatralium operarum dein gregarius miles, procax lingua et miscere cætus histrionali studio doctus,*" which may be translated: There was in the camp one Percennius, formerly a leader of one of the theatrical parties of hired applauders, afterwards a common soldier, noted for his impudence, and, through his experience of exciting enthusiasm for actors, an adept at stirring up a crowd. Here, again, it will be remarked that even Percennius is not said to have been an actor, but merely a theatrical agent for hiring people to applaud certain actors, in which, also, he was the leader.

This amazing misrepresentation of facts, recorded by one of the Latin authors he most affected, is but a striking example of one of Bacon's characteristics. For accuracy of detail he had no care. In the best known of his writings, the *Essays*, carelessness of detail is a very frequent and prominent feature, notwithstanding that he took such pains in elaborating, increasing, and re-publishing them so frequently.

Spedding proposes as an explanation of Bacon's inaccuracies in quotation the words of Dr. Rawley, his chaplain and literary executor: "I have often observed, and so have other men of great account, that if he had occasion to repeat another man's words after him, he had an use and faculty to dress them in better vestments and apparel than they had before, so that the author should find his own speech much amended, and yet the substance of it still retained; as if it had been natural to him to use good forms—as Ovid spake of his faculty of versifying—

Et quod tentabam scribere, versus erat."

On this passage Spedding comments as follows: "This is probably the true explanation of a habit of Bacon's,

which seems at first sight a fault, and, perhaps, sometimes is—and of which a great many instances have been pointed out by Mr. Ellis—a habit of inaccurate quotation. In quoting an author's words, especially where he quotes them merely by way of voucher for his own remark, or in acknowledgment of the source whence he derived it, or to suggest an allusion which may give a better effect to it, he very often quotes inaccurately. Sometimes, no doubt, this was unintentional, the fault of his memory; but more frequently, I suspect, it was done deliberately, for the sake of presenting the substance in a better form, or a form better suited to the particular occasion. In citing the evidence of witnesses, on the contrary, in support of a narrative statement or an argument upon matter of fact, he is always very careful" (Works, I., p. 13).

This wonderful power of Bacon's of repeating substantially what any others had said in conversation in so attractive and improved a form has been insisted on as an undoubted proof of his surpassing dramatic genius. There is no doubt but that for the unprejudiced and competent inquirer, everything in Shakespeare and everything in Bacon suggest or imply their being one and the same unparalleled individual.

Dr. Johnson, in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare, says: "He had no regard to distinction of time or place, but gives to one age or nation without scruple the customs, institutions and opinions of another at the expense, not only of likelihood, but of possibility. These faults Pope has endeavoured, with more zeal than judgment, to transfer to his imagined interpolators. We need not wonder to find Hector quoting Aristotle when we see the loves of Theseus and Hyppolyta combined with the Gothic mythology of fairies. Shakespeare, indeed, was not the only violator of chronology, for in the same age Sidney, who wanted not the advantages

of learning, has in his *Arcadia* confounded the pastoral with the feudal times, the days of innocence, quiet and security with those of turbulence, violence and adventure."

These anachronisms have been often urged as proof that the plays could not have been written by Bacon, but must have been the work of an unscholarly man of genius. It is surprising that this objection should be made by men of letters, seeing that George Steevens (1736—1800), in his edition of Shakespeare, in the notes to *Twelfth Night** and 2 *Henry VI.*, had pointed out that Shakespeare's incongruities of historical circumstances were far outdone by contemporary writers. Thus Lodge, in his *True Tragedie of Marius and Sylla* (1594), speaks of the *Razors of Palermo* and *St. Paul's Steeple*, and has introduced a *Frenchman* named *Don Pedro*, who, in consideration of receiving *forty crowns*, undertakes to poison *Marius*. Stanyhurst, the translator of four books of Virgil (1582), compares Choræbus to a *Bedlamite*, says that Priam girded on his sword *Morglay*, and makes Dido tell Æneas that she would have been contented to have become the mother of a *Cockney*. In the tragedy of *Herod and Antipater*, by Gervase Markham and William Sampson, who were both scholars, is the following:—"Though *cannons* roar, yet you must not be deaf." Spenser mentions *cloth* made at Lincoln during the ideal reign of King Arthur, and has adorned a castle of the same period "with cloth of *Arras* or of *Tours*." Chaucer introduces *guns* in the time of Anthony and Cleopatra, and Salvator Rosa places a *cannon* at the entrance of Holofernes' tent.†

"I undertake," said Schlegel, "to prove that Shakespeare's anachronisms are for the most part committed

* *T.N.* Act V. Sc. 1. ; 2 *Henry VI.* Act IV. Sc. 7.

† "The Poems and Plays of William Shakspeare." London : Scott and Webster. 1833.

purposely and after great consideration. It was frequently of importance to him to bring the subject exhibited, from the background of time, quite near to us." *

Bacon, in the *De Augmentis*, enunciates the principle which explains these seeming absurdities. The thirteenth chapter of the second book begins thus: "I now come to poesy, which is a part of learning in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely free and licensed; and therefore (as I said at first) it is referred to the imagination, which may at pleasure make unlawful matches and divorces of things."

WILLIAM A. SUTTON.

THE CREATORS OF MODERN ENGLISH.

IT is impossible to study the Elizabethan drama without being struck by the Protean versatility of its authors. In swift and dizzying rotation their poetic souls seem to have been metamorphosed into those of Physicians, Divines, Musicians, Courtiers, Florists, Kings, Scientists, Philosophers, Lawyers, and Philologists. They themselves seem to have realised their Protean characteristics, and references to the fable are numerous:—

"I have as many shapes as Proteus had."

—Anon. (*Sir John Oldcastle* I. 2), 1600.

"I can add colors to the chameleon,

Change shapes with Proteus for advantages."

—Shakespeare (3 *Henry VI.* III. 2) 1592

*Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, 1840, vol. II. p. 123

"Proteus ever changed shapes until he was straitened and held fast."—Bacon (*Advancement of Learning*), 1605.

"He then devised himself how to disguise,
For by his mighty science he could take
As many forms and shapes in seeming wise
As ever Proteus to himself could make."

—Spenser (*Fairy Queen* I. ii. 10), 1590.

"He wandered in the world in strange array . . .
Disguised in thousand shapes that none might him bewray."

—Ibid. (III. 6

"I will play the changeling,
I'll change myself into a thousand shapes
To court our brave spectators ; I'll change my postures
Into a thousand different variations
To draw even ladies' eyes to follow mine.
I'll change my voice into a thousand tones
To chain attention : not a changeling, father ?
None but myself shall play the changeling."

—Middleton (*Spanish Gypsy* II. 1), 1653.

"Oh the miserable
Condition of a prince who, though he vary
More shapes than Proteus in his mind and manners,
He cannot win an universal suffrage
From the many-headed monster multitude."

—Massinger (*Emperor of the East* II. 1), 1631—1632.

It is in their rôle of "great philologues" that they now claim attention.

In the time immediately prior to the advent of the dramatists the English language was a slighted, poor, inexpressive and unseemly thing. Finding it an inefficient means of expression the dramatists deliberately constructed a new one.

At that time Englishmen had to pick up their mother tongue as best they could. "The first English Grammar was not published until 1586. Little, if any, English was taught even in the lower classes of the Grammar schools, and this fact accounts for the

wonderful varieties in spelling proper names common to the period. When there is scarcity of writing and printing, language is 'unsettled and variable.'* Macaulay, describing an English county gentleman of William III.'s time, observes:—

"His language and pronunciation were such as we should now expect to have only from the most ignorant clowns. His oaths, coarse jests and scurrilous terms of abuse were uttered with the broadest accents of his province."

One hundred years earlier, when language was even more unformed, the surrounding speech must have struck the ear almost as strangely as a foreign tongue.

In Mrs. Everett Greene's *Letters of Illustrious Ladies* there is quoted an epistle from Elizabeth, Duchess of Norfolk, to her brother, Lord Stafford. It runs:—

"Brorder I pra you to ssand me my ness dorety by kaas I kno har kon dessess se sal not lake hass long hass I leffe and he wold be hord by me at hor haless I kyng he be hone kyne tha ffaless drab and kouk and nat ben I hade hadehar to my couffert."

Mrs. Green appends the following key as the best rendering she can offer:—

"Brother, I pray you to send me my niece Dorothy, because I know her conditions—she shall not lack as long as I live, an you would be heard by me at (all), or else I think you be own kin to the false drab and cook: had it not been. I had had her to my comfort." †

This is an extreme instance, but there is little doubt that the spelling, pronunciation and grammar of the Elizabethan gentry were very uncouth. The speech of the illiterate lower orders must have been many degrees more discordant, reading and writing being accomplishments practically beyond their ken.

* Goadby, *The England of Shakespeare*, p. 101.

† † Extracted from *Social England*, Traill, Vol. III., pp. 244—246.

The playhouse frequenters were almost, if not entirely, "vagrant persons, masterless men, thieves, horse-stealers, whoremongers, cozeners, coneycatchers, contrivers of treason and other idle and dangerous persons." In *The Roaring Girl*, Middleton has preserved a specimen of their uncouth jargon:—

Trapdoor.—"Ben mort, shall you and I heave a bough, mill a ken, or nip a bung, and then we'll couch a hog's-head under the ruffmans, and there you shall wap with me, and I'll niggle with you."

Moll.—"Out, you damned impudent rascal!"

Trap.—"Cut benar whids, and hold your fambles and your stamps."

L. Noland.—"Nay, nay, Moll, why art thou angry? what was his gibberish?"

Moll.—"Marry, this, my lord, says he: 'Ben mort,' good wench, 'shall you and I heave a bough, mil a ken, or nip a bung?' shall you and I rob a house or cut a purse?"

Moll.—"Come, you rogue, sing with me."

SONG.

By *Moll* and *Tearcat*.

"A gage of ben rom-bouse
In a bousing ken of Rom-ville,
Is benar than a caster,
Peck, pennam, lap, or popler,
Which we mill in deuse a vile.
O I wud lib all the lightmans,
O I wud lib all the darkmans
By the salomon, under the ruffmans,
By the salomon, in the hartmans,
And scour the queer cramp ring,
And couch till a palliard docked my dell,
So my bousy nab might skew rom-bouse well.
Avast to the pad, let us bing;
Avast to the pad, let us bing."

All.—“Fine knaves, i' faith!”

ƒ. *Dapper*.—“The grating of ten new cart-wheels, and the grunting of five hundred hogs coming from Rumford market, cannot make a worse noise than this canting language does in my ears.”

Burns, coming from the plough, uttered his inspirations in a dialect familiar to his auditors. So also the West Country poet, William Barnes, and others too numerous to mention; but the Elizabethan dramatists, though for the most part *canaille* writing for the patronage of *canaille*, voiced their poetry in pure and academic English.

It is not nowadays an every-day occurrence for an actor to be able to write a good play, still less usual for him to be able to express himself in poetic form. Probably the “gay boys lewd and vain,” on whose favour the Elizabethan playwright subsisted, would have been equally if not better pleased by a knock-about farce, or a Morrice dance by Kemp. It seems, however, to have been *de rigueur* that the Elizabethan hacks should write in swinging blank verse and spin their drumming decasyllables from their own brains.

The publication, now in progress under the auspices of the Philological Society, of Dr. Murray's *New English Dictionary* renders it possible to say with approximate accuracy how much of the English language we owe to the fellowship of great spirits under consideration. *The New English Dictionary* is a Registry where may be found recorded the birthday and parent, so far as known, of every English word now or ever in use. An examination of this work will, therefore, enable anyone by the Law of Average to arrive at an approximate estimate of the number of words coined in certain periods by certain writers. The analysis of a sequence of 143 pages, equal to 429

columns, selected at random, yielded so incredible a result that I thought it desirable to examine further. My first investigation having by chance fallen upon a group of words including the Latin prefix *Ex*, I decided to examine a further sequence of 143 pages which should include the Greek prefix *Ge*. No author coins from a tongue with which he is not sufficiently familiar to *think* in, and Greek being "neglected and despised," I thought it probable that few words from this source were likely to have come into being during the Elizabethan era. This reasoning having proved correct, it will, I think, be sufficiently approximate to strike an average between the Latin and Greek groups, from which average we can arrive with sufficient accuracy to the probable total aggregate. As it will be many years before the publication of Dr. Murray's great undertaking is completed, it is necessary, for the time being, to be content with merely a rough total.

The Editor informs me that the work when finished will occupy between 15,000 and 16,000 folio pages, each containing three columns. It will, therefore, be well upon the safe side to assume that each sequence of 143 pages represents one-hundredth part of the entire work. Calculating on this basis, we are indebted to the poet Shakespeare for enriching our tongue with the astonishing total of 9,450 newly-coined words.* Our obligations to other contemporary play-wrights, and to the philosophers, Francis Bacon and Thomas Browne, are as follows :—

* It is questionable whether Shakespeare has not been credited by Dr. Murray with a larger total than he is entitled to. Mr. George Stronach has pointed out many instances of words wrongly attributed to Shakespeare, but owing, in reality, to his contemporary, Bacon. The fact that there is a Shakespeare Concordance has in all probability influenced the attribution of many words to Shakespeare which Dr. Murray's readers might on severer search have found elsewhere.

Bacon	1,950
Browne	2,850
Beaumont and Fletcher...	975
Chapman	1,500
Dekker	350
Day	50
Ford	200
Field	—
Greene	800
Heywood	350
Jonson	1,350
Kyd	—
Lodge	100
Lyly	350
Marlowe	525
Marston	650
Massinger	475
Middleton	300
Nash	1,350
Peele	150
Porter	100
Rowley	150
Shirley	150
Spenser	1,200
Tourneur	50
					<hr/>
					15,925
Add Shakespeare...	9,450
					<hr/>
					Total, 25,375
					<hr/>

Although the totals attributed to the various philologers differ in quantity, the figures quoted must be considered in comparison to the amount of literature from which they are extracted. Thus regarded, Tourneur's modest 50 words is on a par with the

2,000 of the more prolific Bacon, Tourneur's being found merely in two plays.

Viewed thus, Sir Thomas Browne's total remains even more extraordinary than it already appears.

Sir John Evans, in his Introduction to *Hydriotaphia*, observes, "The language in which most of Browne's writings are composed is very peculiar, and, in some respects, un-English. The intense Latinity of his style is almost everywhere apparent, and, indeed, anyone comparing the Latin version of the *Religio Medici* with the English, would feel inclined to pronounce the former the original, and the latter a too literal translation. Dr. Johnson says with regard to Sir Thomas Browne's style, that it is 'a tissue of many languages; a mixture of heterogeneous words brought together from distant regions, with terms originally appropriated to one art and drawn by violence into the service of another. But his innovations are sometimes pleasing, and his temerities happy.' Sir Thomas Browne says of himself, in the *Religio Medici*: 'For my own part, besides the jargon and *patois* of several provinces, I understand no less than six languages.'"

The erudition and Latinity of Sir Thomas Browne are matters of every-day note. As an illustration of his fondness for Latin coinages, a recent reviewer quoted the following passage from *Christian Morals*:—

"The Compage of all Physical Truths is not so closely jointed but opposition may find intrusion, nor always so closely maintained as not to suffer attrition. Many Positions seem quodlibetically constituted, and, like a Delphian Blade, will cut on both sides. Some Truths seem almost Falshoods, and some Falshoods almost Truths; wherein Falshood and Truth seem almost æquilibriumously stated, and but a few grains of distinction to bear down the ballance."

Great and admitted as were Browne's capacities in diction, the actors could without effort have given

points to him. Compare, for instance, the following passage from Webster's *White Devil* III. 1., 1612.

"Most *literated* judges, please your Lordships so to *connive* your judgements to the view of this debauched and *diversivolent* woman, who such a black *concatenation* of mischief hath *effected* that to *extirp* the memory of it must be the *consummation* of her and her *projections*."

The love of word-making seems at times to have attained the proportions of a disease. Not infrequently we find the dramatists revelling in mere verbal fireworks.

"My leg is not altogether unpropitiously shaped. There's a word—'unpropitiously'!"

"So help me your sweet bounty you have the most graceful presence, applausive elocuty, amazing volubility, polished adornation, delicious affability."

Marston (*Antonio and Mellida*, part I., IV. 2), 1602.

It was a common device to introduce a new word, supported and expounded by a synonym; at other times we find that upon some novelty making its introductory bow, special attention was directed to its excellence. Thus:—

"He is too peregrinate, as I may call it

[*Nathaniel draws out his table-book.*]

A most singular and choice epithet."

Shakespeare (*Love's Labour Lost* V. 1) 1588.

"I scorn to retort the obtuse jest of a fool.

[*Balurdo draws out his writing-tables and writes.*]

Retort and obtuse, good words, very good words."

Marston (*Antonio and Mellida*, pt. II., I. 3), 1602.

"Here's most amorous weather.

Amorous weather!

Is not amorous a good word?"

Middleton (*Roaring Girl* V. 1), 1611.

As a coinor and connoisseur of language, Bacon was

pre-eminently conspicuous. When a young lawyer, it was noted by a contemporary that "a marked feature of the new pleader was the unusual words wherewith he had spangled his speech."

In the *Promus* we perceive Bacon apparently in the very act of word-making. Jotted down we note *real*, *brazed*, *peradventure*. Next to another entry, *uprouse*, stands the crucible of its creation, *abedd—rose you—owt bed*.

Bacon and the dramatists were great artists in the elegancies of speech. Folio III of the *Promus* is endorsed "Formularies and Elegancies." It no doubt forms part of one of those collections by way of "provision or preparatory store for the furniture of speech and readiness of elocution," which Bacon recommends in *The Advancement of Learning*. In this MS. we perceive the great Word Artist in his workshop. As Dr. Abbott observes, the world ought not willingly to let die so courtly a compliment as entry No. 1196.

"I have not said all my prayers till I have bid you good-morrow,"

or so graceful an epistolary conclusion as entry No. 1398.

"Wishing you all happiness, and myself opportunity to do you service."

Not only the fabric of modern language, but many of our common and every-day salutations, seem to have first come into existence at this period. Dr. Murray credits the earliest printed appearance of *Good-bye*, as a form of address at parting, to Shakespeare. We see it in process of evolution as follows:—

1588. "I thank your worship. God be wy you!"

—Shakespeare (*Love's Labour's Lost* III. 1).

1591. "God b'uy my lord!"

—*Ibid.* (1 *Henry VI.* III. 2).

1600. "Gallants, God buoye all!"

—Heywood (2 *Edward IV.*).

1607. "Farewell, God b'y you Mistress!"

—Middleton (*Roaring Girl*).

In his essay, *Of Travel*, Bacon writes, "When a traveller returns home let him . . . prick in some flowers of that he hath learned abroad into the customs of his own country." In the *Promus* we find him thus at work striving to embellish the English tongue and engraft elegancies of foreign extraction. Dr. Abbott comments upon his efforts as follows:—

"Independently of other interests, many of the notes in the *Promus* are valuable as illustrating how Bacon's all-pervasive method of thought influenced him, even in the merest trifles. *Analogy* is always in his mind. If you can say 'good-morrow,' why should you not also say 'good-dawning' (entry 1206)? If you can anglicise some French words, why not others? Why not say 'good-swoear' (*sic.* entry 1190) for 'good-night,' and 'good-matens' (1192) for 'good-morning'? Instead of 'twilight,' why not substitute 'vice-light' (entry 1420)? Instead of 'impudent,' how much more forcible is 'brazed' (entry 1418)! On the lines of this suggestive principle Francis Bacon pursues his experimental path, whether the experiments be small or great—sowing, as Nature sows, superfluous seeds, in order that out of the conflict the strongest may prevail. For before we laugh at Bacon for his abortive word-experiments, we had better wait for the issue of Dr. Murray's great dictionary which will tell us to how many of these experiments we are indebted for words now current in our language.

"Many interesting philological, or literary, questions will be raised by the publication of the *Promus*. The phrase 'good-dawning,' for example, just mentioned, is found only once in Shakespeare, put into the mouth of

the affected Oswald (*Lear* II. 2, 1), 'Good-dawning to thee, friend.' The quartos are so perplexed by this strange phrase that they alter 'dawning' into 'even,' although a little farther on Kent welcomes the 'comfortable beams' of the rising sun. Obviously, 'dawning' is right; but did the phrase suggest itself independently to Bacon and Shakespeare? Or did Bacon make it current among Court circles, and was it picked up by Shakespeare afterwards? Or did Bacon jot down this particular phrase, not from analogy, but from hearing it in the Court? Here, again, we must wait for Dr. Murray's dictionary to help us."

Unfortunately, Dr. Murray's readers seem to have missed *good-dawning*. The expression is unnoted in the dictionary.

In creating strange words and giving them currency by weaving them into familiar dialogue, the dramatists well knew on how momentous a task they were employed. It would be quite wrong to imagine that the poets' vocabularies were fortuitous or dropped unconsciously from their pens. Nash asserts that he was compelled to resort to boisterous compound words in order to compensate for the great defect of the English tongue, which "of all languages most swarmeth with the single money of monosyllables."*

In this "cleansing of our language from barbarism" and substitution of classicisms and exotics it has been shown how prodigious a share each dramatist bore. In the *quality* of the coinage I confess myself unable to detect any appreciable distinction between the efforts of the actors on the one hand and of the philosophers on the other. In his *Apology for Actors* (1612) Heywood legitimately glories that "the English tongue, the most harsh, uneven, broken and mixed language in the world,

* See "Dictionary of National Biography." Vol. 40, p. 108.

now fashioned by the dramatic art, had grown to a most perfect language."

Whether this new and wonderful creation was appreciated by the theatrical scum, History has not recorded. If, in Caliban, Shakespeare has drawn the wild beast monster multitude, the words of Prospero may, as Mrs. Pott recently suggested, have a new and unexpected meaning.

"I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage.
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes
With words that made them known."
Caliban.—"You taught me language ; and my profit on't
Is, I know how to curse ! The red plague rid you
For learning me your language !"

HAROLD BAYLEY.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

"LET IT BE INQUIRED."

IN reviewing what had been done and what left undone for the *Increase and Advancement of Learning*, Bacon assumes as indisputable that the greatest and most difficult works are overcome by three things: (1) by ample reward; (2) by prudence and soundness of direction; (3) by co-operation or conjunction of labours.

Of these, the second, *i.e.*, "the pointing out and setting forth of the straight and ready way to the thing which is to be done, must be placed first." In short, having clearly resolved upon our object, we must secure

that the methods by which we attempt to reach that object are right and direct.*

Bacon points out how rarely men *originate inquiries*; and that the difficulty in bringing forward a new discovery, or in perfecting and making it current, is "not so much in the matter or subject, as it is *in the crossness and indisposition of the mind of man to think any such thing*, to will, or to resolve it. . . . In which sort of things it is the manner of men, first to wonder that any such thing should be possible, and after it is found out to wonder again how the world should miss it so long."†

In enumerating many "impediments" to the advance of learning, he notes, "the over-much credit which has been given unto authors in making them *dictators*, that their words should stand, and not counsellors, to give advice." The damage received by sciences from this cause is "infinite"; it is "the principal cause that hath kept them low, at a stay, without growth or advancement."‡

"How long," he says, "shall we let a few received authors stand up like *Hercules' columns*, beyond which there shall be no sailing or discovery in science?" and *in those who have pretended to knowledge*, "what hurt has been done by the affectation of professors, and the distraction of such as are no professors." He laments that men had so little "combined their wits," or "induced search"; that every man worked in his own way, or going no farther than his guide, so that there was *no advance*; but "in the descent and continuance of wits and labours," the succession was usually a mere "handing on of the weakest and most popular opinions, the writers adorning rather than adding to the general stock of knowledge; or if any addition were made, it was rather

* De Aug. ii. Sped. iv. 284. † Interpn. Nat. Sped. iii. 324.

‡ Advt. L. i. Sped. iii. 289.

"a refining of a part than an increase of the whole," * and he quotes Scripture as to how a man may *wander out of the way*, "*rounding up and down*," † so that, progressing only in a circle, he makes no advance.

Fellow students, I earnestly exhort you to weigh and consider these, and many like words, of the great *Bacon*. Daily experience demonstrates their accuracy, and when applied to our own researches into the facts concerning our great master and his works, they seem to be nothing short of prophetic.

Now if it be true that impediments to the knowledge of *Bacon* are the same which he found opposing new discoveries or original inquiries in his own day, surely we should combine, as evidently he and his collaborators combined, to remove these obstacles, and to make sure that we all work towards one common object, by a straight and direct road ; not "*rounding up and down*" in a circular groove.

Our object, surely, is to discover *Bacon*, to track his life, his aims, his achievements, and the vast debts which we all owe to him. Finding many deficiencies in knowledge concerning our poet-philosopher, I made, many years ago, a table, or list, of such deficiencies (a table which has, unhappily, had to be continually enlarged). I now print the chief items, in the hope (may it not be a vain hope) that others will combine to complete some of my imperfect efforts, or may originate further discoveries and researches. Let me add, for the encouragement of those who will bring diligence and perseverance to this entrancing inquiry, that their labour cannot be lost. "All dial lines lead to the centre," and if we only set a firm grasp upon the great chain which links all *Bacon's* works, it matters not where we begin in *Baconian* research, we shall be led from link to link, forwards, upwards, until "*from Homer's chair*" we find

* *Interpn. Nat. Sped.* iii. 231. † *Interpn. Nat. Sped.* iii. 232.

ourselves at "the foot of Jupiter's throne"; for the science, learning, poetry, theology, and all beneficent enterprises inaugurated in the age from 1570 to 1670 will be found to have their root or culmination in the great unknown—"Francis Bacon."

Let it be Inquired.

(1) *Historical.*

- a. Who was *Bacon*?
- b. Who were his parents? and where was he born?
- c. What contemporary records are there of these particulars, and of his childhood, youth, and college education?
- d. Of his travels in the suite of Sir Amyas Paulet, his consequent visits to the French towns mentioned in 1 *Henry, VI.*, and of his stay at Bordeaux with Anthony Bacon and Michel de Montaigne?
- e. What is known of his travels at this time in Spain and Italy; and again later? Especially, did he not visit Venice (and there establish a paper-mill), Padua, and Rome? What was his connection with Wittenberg and other places in Germany and Holland?
- f. Why is his residence at Canonbury Tower ignored in all his biographies? What did he there? Did Prince Henry and others there hold secret conclaves? Did he thence organise and conduct his Secret Society, and supervise the production of the *Shakespeare* Plays, for which the properties were stored in the gateway of the Priory of St. John's, Clerkenwell, near at hand?
- g. Where was he married? After 1626 what became of his wife?
- h. When and where did *Bacon* die? (at least four different places are named by his biographers). Who saw him die? Who were present at his

funeral? Who made any record of these facts? Where was he buried? (Certainly *not* at St. Michael's).

- i. Why has no comment been made by biographers on the thirty-two remarkable and instructive *Elegies* or *Eulogies* — the *Manes Verulamiani* (*printed in Latin in the Harleian Miscellanies—translated and published BACONIANA New Series, October, 1896, to October, 1897.*)³
- j. Did *Bacon* really die in 1626? Did he not *die to the world*, to which, in two or three little poems (one in his own writing), he bids “farewell?” Did he then retire in 1626?—whither?—travelling again?—living in the Isle of Man? Withdrawing finally to some hermitage or religious house, where he passed the rest of his life under the name of Pater X, and in full possession of his faculties, revising and enlarging his former works, and writing others, chiefly poetical and theological?
- k. Was X a sign for the “unknown quantity”—the Saltire Cross, arms alike of St. Andrew and of St. Alban?—Was it also the -|- of the Rose Cross turned sideways? Was it the sign of the microcosm, or the mind as “the little world of man?” Was it the sign of light or knowledge, containing in its parts the letters LVX?
- l. Did *Bacon* die at the age of the “Rosicrucian Father”—106?
- m. Who were his friends? In what special ways did they assist him? What claims had any of them to rank as authors, originators, or discoverers? (Immense research is here required into the MS. collections, letters, etc., which connect themselves with *Bacon*. See especially the Tenison, Gibson, Carew, Wharton, and Manners-Sutton MSS. in

Lambeth Palace Library, and the Harleian, Cotton, Pembroke, Finch-Hatton, Rawley, Hatfield, and other collections at the British Museum. Also the mysterious "Douce Collection," part of which (unless it has been spirited away) is in the British Museum, and part in the Bodleian Library. Likewise the "sealed bag" of Queen Elizabeth's letters said to be at the Record Office.

- n. The feigned, compound, or ambiguous "Biographies" of *Bacon's* friends and helpers should be carefully examined. They seem to be ingenious interweavings of the warp of one Life with the woof of another.
- o. Similarly of the disguised portraits of "authors," "discoverers," "philosophers," "poets," etc., a subject already broached, but not followed up.
- p. Why are not the busts and medals of *Bacon*, which exist screened from public view, and sometimes with difficulty to be seen, engraved and thoroughly displayed and made familiar to the world in general? What is the influence, who are the agents in a method of gentle but firm suppression of which Baconian researchers are now fully aware?
- q. Was "Bacon" no more *Bacon* than he was *Shakespeare*, and was not the true family name of Sir Nicholas, *Becon* or *Beacon*, and not "Bacon," this being a pseudonym adopted on account of certain facilities which the word offered to cryptographic writers in their numerical ciphers—and also because of the infinite number of puns, quibbles, allusions, and jests which can be contrived by means of this name?
- r. Who then were to benefit or be informed by means of these devices? Was "Bacon," indeed, the head centre of a vast secret society? Was the

upper section of this society first created ? Was the lower section merely *mechanical* in its operation ? That is to say, were the higher grades (whether they are to be called Rosicrucians or Masons) of this Invisible Brotherhood, the literary, scientific, philosophical and religious section, the *head* or *mind* of the brotherhood, and the lower section, the *hands* or executors, such as printers, designers, publishers, amanuenses, etc.

We were happily relieved from one controversy by the publication, in the *Journal of the Quatuor Coronati*, of Dr. Wynn Westcott's address to a Lodge of Masons, when he plainly (and to the apparent annoyance of some) asserted the common origin of the Rose Cross Fraternity with the Masons, who seem to inquire little into their own pedigree and history. All questions as to the existence of secret means of communication by ciphers, signs, symbols, marks, jargon, ambiguities, etc. (such as we find in all *old* Baconian books, and even, less conspicuously, in such books at the present time), are hereby ended, or rendered comprehensible. I have the less hesitation or compunction in speaking of these things, knowing that the highest in this beneficent society regret the obligation to secrecy under which they labour, and that they would gladly see the truth shine forth.

(2). *Bacon's Aims and Aspirations.*

- a. Was not his ultimate aim the inauguration of another golden age ; a perfect restoration and reformation of learning ; a new birth of philosophy, science, and works for the benefit of the human race throughout the wide world and in the future ages ?
- b. Was not this to culminate in the Mingling of Earth and Heaven ; the marriage of Truth and Beauty (as shadowed in the sonnets) ; of things material

with things spiritual ; of Nature and Art, Science and Poetry ?

- c. And further ; was it not his supreme hope and effort to draw together the opposed and too often warring Churches, and by degrees to produce, first a wide and tolerant spirit in the religious world, and in the end, "*unity*," though not uniformity ?

(3). *Work achieved.—Literary.*

- a. This section is too large for our present space ;* it demands a close philological investigation of the vocabulary, turns of speech, Promus notes, grammatical peculiarities, tricks of style, and especially of the wonderfully figurative and allusive language, the identities of quotations, opinions, sentiments, antitheses, and so forth, in every book which comes under discussion.
- b. Inquire whether *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* be not *key works* to all "the rest." Is not *Bacon* a map or chart guiding the inquirer to all the learning and sciences which the author declared that he had taken to be his province ? Does he not help us to the methodical arrangement of the multitudinous researches, or inquisitions, experiments, and studies which he undertook in every known department of science ?
- c. Is it not discernible by the combined aid of *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* that the author practically *made our present English*, and (I think) mightily added to and adorned the languages of Continental countries ? Where he did not develop or perfect his idea, did he not at least, "chalk successors their way" ?
- d. Did he not make the first translations of many of

* See BACONIANA, April, 1896, iv. 70.

the classics—Homer, Plutarch, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Tacitus, and others?

- e. Did he systematically take mere fragments of works, enlarge, complete, and publish them (*e.g.*, the works of *Roger Bacon*, of Thomas à Kempis, St. Augustin, etc.) as original works by the accredited authors?

Many more such questions force themselves upon the Baconian student—inquiries upon which space does not allow me to enter, but only to suggest: Of the true history of printing and paper-making; ciphers, anagrams and the secret marks perceptible in books from the 16th to the 20th centuries; of the first news-letters or newspapers; the first dictionaries, books of reference, and collections; of old libraries and other foundations, charitable and scientific, dramatic, literary, and theological; of concealed collections, garbled indexes, and so forth.

It is now plain that the answers to all our doubts and questionings are known to certain persons in our great libraries and colleges; and that, when we fail, in this particular study, to obtain direct and convincing answers to straightforward questions, the matter in hand is worthy of pursuit, and the obstacles placed through no ill will, but in compliance with “obligations” (now I think, *anachronisms*) imposed by the Grand Master himself.

C. M. POTT.

"THE ARTE OF ENGLISH POESIE."

IN 1589 the above work was published by Richard Field, with a dedication to Lord Burleigh dated 28th May.

In 1722 was first printed a curious MS. by one Edmund Bolton, probably written in 1620, containing a passage stating that the fame was that the *Arte* was the work of one of Queen Elizabeth's Gentlemen Pensioners—Puttenham.

The ascription to Puttenham therefore rests merely on a rumour noted thirty-one and published one hundred and thirty-three years after the date of the work.

Dr. Garnett and Mr. E. Gosse, writing of English literature of the period, say "the *Arte* is attributed, on by no means exclusive authority, to one of two brothers Puttenham," and add, "We must acknowledge grave doubts whether it can rightly be attributed to either."

The "Dictionary of National Biography" shows that these brothers were frequently in prison; the known age of one of them does not fit with the personal statements in the book, and the other is not recorded to have been abroad.

Mr. Sidney Lee, alluding to the author, says: "He was the first English writer who attempted philosophical criticism of literature. Mr. Gilchrist, an earlier critic, expressed the opinion that the *Arte* was intrinsically one of the most valuable books of the age of Elizabeth.

The work being so important and its authorship still an open question, I may be excused for suggesting another likely author.

The date of writing of the *Arte* is, according to the opinion of Mr. Arber, about the year 1585.

In 1584 Vantroullier, the Edinburgh printer, had

published for King James of Scotland "A Treatise of the Airt of Scottis Poesie." On its title page was the printer's trade mark and motto, "Anchora Spei."

My theory is that Queen Elizabeth, in a spirit of royal emulation, thereupon thought well to show what she and her literary assistants could do. Francis at that date was greatly in the Queen's confidence. In 1582 he had written for her a monograph on the state of affairs on the Continent. In 1585 he was M.P. and made some marvellously brilliant speeches. He also wrote to the Queen a long and careful memorandum on State affairs and the question of her personal safety.

It is very odd to find a penniless younger son of Nicholas Bacon taking, before he is barely twenty-five, such a prominent part in the affairs of his sovereign, of whose purse he was a pensioner. Both Francis and the Queen were poets and expert linguists, and the *Arte* gave an opportunity to the Queen to publish her verses and recollections, which could not well be given in print in any other way. At the same time it enabled Francis to expound the rules of poetry, which he had studied. Says the author in Book III., chapter 25, "We have in our humble conceit sufficiently performed our promise or rather dutie to your Majestie in the description of this arte." Upon this point a few words in Bacon's Apology concerning Essex are instructive. "Her Majesty taking a liking to my pen . . . and likewise upon some other declarations which in former times, by her appointment, I put in writing, commanded me to pen that book."

Mr. Arber points out that the *Arte*, although probably begun in 1585, was not altered and amended until 1589, when it was printed by Vantroullier's son-in-law, Richard Field, under, curiously enough, the same trade mark, "Anchora Spei," which by this date had doubtless passed into the latter's possession.

Bacon, writing years afterwards to King James, refers to "your Majesty's Royal promise (which to me is Anchora Spei)."

The composition of the *Arte* having been decided upon by these distinguished persons, the next characteristic precaution would be to shroud the authorship under such a veil as could not with any certainty be pierced.

The author remarks that, "The good Poet or maker ought to dissemble his arte." Compare this with Bacon's Essays, "He who would be secret must be a dissembler in some degree."

We may therefore expect to meet with a number of statements purposed to throw people off the scent, combined with others which may be true in substance and fact.

With this precaution well in mind, there is much *prima facie* evidence pointing to Francis as the author.

It is also quite likely that Francis wrote the verses entitled the *Partheniades*, which the author states he presented to the Queen on a certain New Year's day. One of the verses alludes to "twenty years ago" of Her Majesty's reign. The usually assigned date is New Year's day, 1579, when Francis was probably in England, but the phrase would perhaps more correctly indicate the year 1578. Francis came from France about 20th March, 1578-9, but according to Rawley's *Life*, he visited England in 1578, before his final return. It would be at this time that his miniature, bearing date 1578, was painted by Hilliard, the Queen's Court Limner. Again, who amongst the Queen's courtiers, skilled as a poet, better answers the description of one who had spent his youth amid foreign Courts (Francis was there from September, 1576), who was closely intimate with Lord Burghley and Sir Nicholas Bacon, and who (according to Hazlewood) quotes frequently from Quintillian, the favourite author with Sir Nicholas?

Again, though treated as Francis was by the Bacon family with much distinction, Sir Nicholas, although a very rich man, carefully prepared his will a few weeks before his death, but left nothing to Francis, who, it will be seen by the latter's letter to Burleigh of 18th October, 1580, was eventually provided by the Queen herself with the means to live. Francis no doubt became a gentleman pensioner of the Court. No acknowledged poet of the period answers to the description the writer of the *Arte* gives of himself.

It will no doubt be objected that Bacon could have had no personal knowledge of Queen Mary or Edward VI., nor could he have been present at the banquet in Brussels in honour of the Earl of Arundel, nor at Spain in the reign of Charles IX. Nor was he educated at Oxford. On the other hand, had these experiences, no doubt gathered from others and with permission, entered as the writer's own, his anonymity would have been absolutely gone, since by the admissions the actual author could have been readily traced and identified.

"He who would be secret must be a dissembler in some degree." This dissembling may be less than appears if it should turn out, as I suspect, that some of the incidents occurred to, and were interpolated by, Queen Elizabeth herself.

The following is suspicious of royalty:—"The eclogue Elpine which *we* made, being but eighteen years old, to King Edward, a Prince of great hope."

Elizabeth was eighteen in September, 1551, while her brother Edward was king. The epitaph on Sir John Throgmorton may be another interpolation by her Majesty; Sir John was judge of the Palatine Court of her Duchy of Chester. He died in 1580. Her close intimacy with the Throgmortons is also shown by the letter of Paulet to Burleigh in September, 1576, which states that he is taking to Paris with him a son of Sir

Nicholas Throgmorton (brother of Sir John) at the recommendation of Her Majesty, and therefore he could not refuse him. Sir John was knighted by the Queen at Kenilworth. His wife, according to the lists of New Year's gifts, was at Court in 1578 and 1579.

Passing to the internal evidence of mannerisms and style, I first draw attention to the dedication of the book to Lord Burghley, nominally the work of the printer.

Compare:—

“Bestowying upon your Lordship the first vewe of this mine impression.”

with:—

‘The first heir of my invention’

occurring in the dedication to *Venus and Adonis*, also published by Field in 1593.

Then contrast this concluding passage in the *Arte*:—

“I presume so much upon your Majestie's most mild and gracious judgment, *howsoever you conceive of myne abilitie to any better or greater service*, that yet in this attempt ye will allow of my loyall and good intent, always endeavouring to do your Majesty the best and greatest of these services I can,”

with a passage in a letter written years later by Bacon to King James:—

“I hope and wish at least that this which I have written may be of some use to your Majesty. . . . At the least it is the effect of my care and poor abilitie, which if in me be any, it is given me to no other end but faithfully to serve your Majesty.”

I have italicised some words in the former passage. We know that in 1592, when he wrote to Burleigh, Bacon was openly begging for office of some kind. “I

ever bare a mind (in some middle place that I could discharge) to serve her Majesty." "Place of any reasonable countenance doth bring commandment of more wits than of man's own, which is the thing I greatly affect."

Internal evidence also shews that the work, probably begun in 1585, was altered and added to even up to 1589. The practice of altering and adding was common to Bacon's acknowledged works. "I alter ever when I add, so that nothing is finished until all be finished" (Bacon to Tobie Matthew).

Internal evidence shews the writer to have been a barrister of such familiarity with law and pleading as we should expect Francis to have attained at this period, 1585-9. In the last year he was made a Reader of his Inn. Below are some illustrations from the *Arte* of this proficiency in law.

"And this figure is much used by our English pleaders in the Star Chamber and Chancery, which they call to confess and avoid."

"It serveth many times to great purpose to prevent our adversaries' arguments and take upon us to know before what our judge, or adversary, or hearer thinketh."

"It is also very many times used for a good pollicie in pleading."

"As he that in a litigious case for land would prove it, not the adversaries, but his clients."

"No man can say its his by heirship, nor by legacie or testator's device, nor that it came by purchase or engage, nor from his Prince for any good service."

"This man deserves to be endited of petty larceny for pilfering other men's devices from them and converting them to his own use."

Compare Bacon's remarks to Elizabeth in Apothegms concerning Heywood. "No, madam, for treason I cannot deliver opinion that there is any, but for

felony very many. Because he had stolen so many of his sentences and conceits out of Cornelius Tacitus.”

Bacon’s love of the art of persuasion (which he was fond of illustrating with the story of the unresisted invasion of Italy, where the conqueror came with chalk in his hands to mark up lodging places for his soldiers rather than with arms to force their way) seems also a characteristic of the writer of the *Arte*.

In *The Wisdom of the Ancients*, 1609, he writes:—“The fable of Orpheus, though trite and common, has never been well interpreted.” Then he explains, “Orpheus’ music is of two sorts . . . the first may fitly be applied to natural philosophy, the second to moral or *civil* discipline . . . by *persuasion* and *eloquence*; insinuating the love of virtue, equity and concord in the minds of men, draws multitudes of men to a Society, makes them subject to laws, obedient to government.”

In the grounds of Gorhambury, Bacon erected a statute to Orpheus inscribed “Philosophy Personified.”

In his discourse on the Plantation of Ireland, 1608, he stated, “That Orpheus, by the virtue of the sweetness of his harp, did call and *assemble* the beasts and birds of their nature, *wild and savage*, to stand about him as in a theatre,” which he explained to imply the reducing and plantation of kingdoms when people of barbarous manners are brought to give ear to the wisdom of laws and governments.

The passage in the *Arte* relating to Orpheus is at the beginning of Book I, chapter 3. After referring to sweet and *eloquent persuasion*, he proceeds, “And Orpheus *assembled* the wilde beastes to come in heards to harken to his musicke and by that means made them tame, implying thereby how, by his discreet and wholesome lessons, uttered in harmonie and with melodious instruments, he brought the *rude and savage* people to a more *civil and orderly life*.”

Internal evidence shews the writer of the *Arte*, like Bacon and the writer of the Shakespeare plays, to be fond of introducing new and unaccustomed words. In Book III., chapter 4, before proceeding to discuss a number of novel words used by him, the writer of the *Arte* says, "And peradventure the writer hereof be in that behalfe no lesse faultie then any other, using many strange and unaccustomed wordes and borrowed from other languages."

I will next give a few parallelisms between the *Arte* (A) and the writings of Bacon (B) and Shakespeare (S):—

A.—"Every man's stile is for the most part according to the matter and subject."

B.—"Style is as the subject matter."

A.—"He cannot lightly do amiss if he have besides a special regard to all the circumstances of the person, place, time, cause, and purpose he hath in hand."

B.—"It is good to vary and suit speeches with the present occasions and to have a moderation in all our speeches especially in jesting of religion, state, great persons, etc."

S.—"He must observe their moods on whom he jests
The quality of persons and the time."

A.—"And maketh now and then very vice go for a formal virtue."

S.—"There is no vice so simple but assumes
Some mark of virtue on his outward parts."

A.—"But now because our Maker or Poet is to play many parts and not one alone."

S.—"And one man in his time plays many parts."

Love in its two aspects are treated much alike by the writer of the *Arte* and by Bacon.

A.—"For love there is no frailtie in flesh and blood

as excusable as it, no comfort or discomfort greater than the good and bad success thereof, nothing more natural to man, nothing of more force to vanquish his will and to inveigle his judgment.”

B.—“Love is a pure gain and advancement in nature, it is not a good by comparison but a true good; it is not an ease of pain but a true purchase of pleasures.”

“It checks with business and troubleth men’s fortunes and maketh men that they can no ways be true to their own ends.”

I have now presented what I think to be a fair *prima facie* case for ascribing to Francis Bacon the authorship of *The Arte of English Poesie*.

In seeking to add another work to the long list now ascribed to the authorship of *Lord St. Alban*, it may be objected that it was impossible for one man to have accomplished so much. I ask those objectors to bear in mind that his acknowledged writings only fill six octavo volumes. Compare this with the productions of Dumas, or the 290 volumes accredited to Maurice Iokai, the Hungarian.

Should any reader desire to read the *Arte* (Arber reprints) it can be obtained from A. Constable and Co., for a small price. The *Arte* shows that its writer was easily familiar with all the technicalities of prose and verse. It is consistent with Bacon’s methods that he should have sought to instruct his nation in an art of which he was a master, though concealed.

PARKER WOODWARD.

A DUOLOGUE

BETWEEN AN ENQUIRER AND LORD SAINT ALBAN.

Enquirer.—Why does Shakespeare in *Cymbeline* say, “Winking Mary-buds begin to ope their golden eyes”?

Lord St. Alban.—“Some flowers have respect to the sunne by opening and shutting. Mary-Golds, tulippas, pimperl, and, indeed, most flowers do open and spread their leaves abroad when the sun shineth serene and fair.”—*Natural History*.

Enquirer.—Yes, when “Phœbus ’gins arise.” Well, can you explain why Macbeth at his Banquet says, “Now, good digestion wait on appetite, and health on both”?

Lord St. Alban.—Because “The appetite is the spur of the digestion.” “For the preservation of health the stomach should be in good appetite; because appetite promotes digestion.”—*A delineation of the particular History of Life and Death*.

Enquirer.—Please tell me why Iago in *Othello* says, “He that filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed,” and “Good name in man and woman is the immediate jewel of their soul.”

Lord St. Alban.—“Men’s souls are more precious than their bodies, and are their GOOD NAMES.”—*Ibid*.

Enquirer.—Can you make it clear why the First Senator in *Coriolanus* says, “Leave us to cure this cause”? It is a curious expression to use.

Lord St. Alban.—“It is in vain to CURE the accidents of a disease except the CAUSE be found and removed.”—*Letter to Buckingham*.

Enquirer.—May I ask why in *A Winter’s Tale* Shake-

speare says, "Hot lavender, mint, etc., are given to men of middle age"?

Lord St. Alban.—"After a man is come to his middle age heat consumeth the spirits."—*Natural History*.

Enquirer.—But do you ever speak of hot herbs?

Lord St. Alban.—"Certain herbs, and those hot ones, as Lavender, Sage, Hyssop."—*Natural History*.

Enquirer.—Hamlet tells Polonius that the actor "holds the Mirror up to Nature," and is "the Chronicle of the Time." Is he?

Lord St. Alban.—"History is of three kinds, the first we call Chronicles, it representeth a TIME."—*Advancement of Learning*.

Enquirer.—A History of a TIME is a Chronicle, but is a play a History?

Lord St. Alban.—"Representative* (Poesy) is as a visible History, and is an image of actions as if they were present, as History is of actions in Nature, as they are, that is, past."—*Ibid*.

Enquirer.—The Chorus in *Henry V.* says much the same. He asks to be admitted Chorus "to this History." Can you tell me why the "Wooden O, or Globe," was given that title? in which he asks "to cram the very casques that did affright the air at Agincourt."

Lord St. Alban.—"It is the perfect law of Enquiry of Truth, that nothing be in the GLOBE of Matter which should not be likewise in the GLOBE of CRYSTAL or Form. That . . . there be not anything in being and action which should not be drawn and collected into contemplation and Doctrine."—*Ibid*.

* George Newnes' edition of the "Advancement of Learning," in the *Contents* prints this word "*Dramatical*." Mr. Edwin Reed, p. 136 of "Francis Bacon or Shake-speare?" gives the line thus: "*Dramatica est veluti historia spectabilis*."

Enquirer.—Do you mean that the Globe Theatre was a reflecting Crystal in which, held up to nature, men's actions and hearts were seen?

Lord St. Alban.—"The precept that I conceive to be most summary is to obtain that window that Momus did require—to look into the frame of men's hearts—not only of persons but of actions, what are on foot, how they are conducted, and how they import."—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—And have you done this?

Lord St. Alban.—"Thus, I have made, as it were, a small GLOBE of the Intellectual world—the good, if any be, is due to the fat of the sacrifice, to be incensed to the honour first, of the Divine Majesty."—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—Explain, please, why the Chorus desires a "Kingdom for a Stage, princes to act, and monarchs to behold the swelling scene."

Lord St. Alban.—"This GLOBE which seems to us a dark and shady body is in view of God as a crystal. So unto Princes and States,—the natures and dispositions of the people, their conditions, and necessities, their factions and combinations, their animosities and discontents, ought to be in great part clear and transparent. . . . In Governors toward the governed, all things ought, as far as frailty of man permitteth, to be manifest and revealed."—*Ibid.*

Enquirer.—What is your opinion of the stage as a means of education?

Lord St. Alban.—"The action of the Theatre, though modern States esteem it but ludicrous unless it be satirical and biting, was carefully watched by the ancients that it might improve mankind in virtue; and indeed many wise men and great philosophers have thought it to the mind as the bow to the fiddle."—*Ibid.*

ALICIA A. LEITH.

BACON'S SCRIVENERY.

IN the preceding issue of *BACONIANA* a correspondent enquired who was the authority for the assertion that Ben Jonson was one of Bacon's "good pens." Apparently it was Dr. Wm. Rawley—the Lord Chancellor's "first and last chaplain."

In "*Remains now set forth by him under the title of Baconiana*," Archbishop Tenison relates that the Latin translation of Bacon's *Essays* "was a work performed by diverse hands; by those of Dr. Hackett (late Bishop of Lichfield), Mr. Benjamin Johnson (the learned and judicious poet), and others whose names I once heard from Dr. Rawley, but I cannot now recall them."

It is a pity the Archbishop's memory failed him. The names of Bacon's "good pens which forsake me now" would now-a-days be of profound interest.

At the foot of folio 109 of his *Promus* notes, Bacon wrote *The Law at Twickenham for mery tales*. This is, apparently, a reference to the Scrivenery and its staff of skilled penmen maintained by Francis and his brother Anthony. It is believed that this scriptorium was originally started in Gray's Inn, but removed to the privacy of Twickenham in order to escape the meddlesome attentions of the Scriveners' Company, which held a rigorous monopoly within the jurisdiction of the city. It seems to have been used for literary purposes, and for the ciphering and deciphering of political documents. In the correspondence of Anthony and Francis Bacon allusions to both purposes are fairly frequent. Thus a political agent, Standen, writes, sending his travels in Turkey, Italy and Spain, "Nothing too high in price for you," out of which, and the Zibaldone MS., Anthony is to copy what he likes. If Standen discovers a lost manuscript (his discourse on the Spanish State) Anthony shall have it. Morgan

Colman, an English correspondent, writes in September, 1592, that he is feeding himself with his papers, which he trusts will deliver fruit well pleasing to Anthony.*

In 1594-5 we find Francis writing to Anthony from "Twickenham Park this 25th of January."

"I have here an idle pen or two, specially one that was cozened, thinking to have got some money this term. I pray you send me somewhat else for them to write out beside your Irish collection, which is almost done. There is a collection of Dr. James (Dean of Christchurch) of foreign States largeliest of Flanders, which though it be no great matter, yet I would be glad to have it."

In 1596 Essex sends by his Secretary Cuffe "a true relation of the action at Cadiz," Cuffe writing to Anthony,

"The original you are to keep, because my Lord charged me to turn either the whole or the sum of it into French, and to cause it to be sent to some good personage in these parts under a false name or anonymously."

In 1601 or thereabouts Francis writes to Anthony,

"Good brother; I send you the supplication which Mr. Topcliffe lent me. It is curiously written and worth the writing out for the art, though the argument be bad. But it is lent me but for two or three days. So God keep you."

This literary Bureau seems to have been in full swing for many years. In 1623 Bacon wrote to his friend Tobie Matthew:

"My labours are now most set to have those works which I had formerly published . . . well translated into Latin by the help of some good pens which forsake me not."

We have little information as to the "good pens," but as we have seen, according to Archbishop Tenison,

* Birch I. 85.

Ben Jonson was one of the group. Others were Hobbes, the philosopher, and Thomas Bushell. Aubrey writes that the Lord Chancellor Bacon loved to converse with Hobbes. "He assisted his Lordship in translating several of his Essays into Latin. . . . His Lordship was a very contemplative person, and was wont to contemplate in his delicious walks at Gorhambury and dictate to Mr. Bushell or some other of his gentlemen that attended him with ink and paper ready to set down presently his thoughts."*

Peter Boëner records of his master that he "seldom saw him take up a book. He only ordered his chaplain (William Rawley) and me to look in such and such an author for a certain place, and then he dictated to us early in the morning what he had invented and composed during the night."†

The relations between Bacon and his bodyguard of scribes and shorthand writers seem to have been of the most intimate and affectionate character. Spedding states that the MS. of *Filum Labyrinthi* is endorsed at the top of the first page in Bacon's handwriting with the words AD FILIOS, while the reverential admiration of the "sons" for their philosopher and friend evinces itself in exalted eulogy.

There is reason to believe that a manuscript executed at Bacon's Scrivenery is now in existence. The document in question was discovered in the year 1867, among some manuscripts at Northumberland House, Charing Cross, and is now at Alnwick Castle, in the possession of the Duke of Northumberland. This has been recently edited and sumptuously reproduced in *facsimile* by Mr. Fr. J. Burgoyne. By the industry of Mr. T. le Marchant Douse,‡ the handwriting has been identified

* Life of Hobbes. Aubrey. Vol. II., pt. 2, p. 602.

† Spedding. Vol. XIV., p. 566.

‡ "The Northumberland Manuscript," by T. le Marchant Douse. London. 1904.

as that of John Davies, of Hereford, a professional scrivener and the most skilful penman of his time. His profession was to copy documents for his various employers, and also to give instruction in the art of penmanship. He was also a scholar, educated at Oxford University, and the writer of numerous sonnets. One of these is addressed, "To the royall, ingenious and all-learned Knight, Sr. Francis Bacon."

"Thy bounty and the Beauty of thy Witt
 Comprised in Lists of Law and learned Arts,
 Each making thee for great Imployment fitt
 Which now thou hast, (though short of thy deserts)
 Compells my pen to let fall shining Inke
 And to bedew the Baies that deck thy Front ;
 And to thy health in Helicon to drinke
 As to her Bellamour the Muse is wont :
 For, thou dost her embozom ; and, dost vse
 Her company for sport twixt grave affaires :
 So vtterest Law the liuelyer through thy Muse.
 And for that all thy Notes are sweetest Aires ;
 My Muse thus notes thy worth in ev'ry Line,
 With yncke which thus she sugers ; so, to shine."

From this, as Mr. Douse observes, it seems that Bacon had recently made him a present in money, or more probably had paid him lavishly for some assistance.

Apart, however, from the evidence of this sonnet, the contents of the MS. point to the conclusion that Davies must at some time have been in Bacon's employment. Six out of the nine pieces which the MS. contains are transcripts of Bacon's unpublished work, to which an outsider would scarcely have had access. The outer sheet forms an Index or Table of Contents, and, although the page has been scribbled over and damaged severely by fire and dust, the following titles can still be read upon it :—

Mr. ffrancis Bacon.
 Of tribute or giving what is dew.

The praise of the worthiest vertue.
 The praise of the worthiest affection.
 The praise of the worthiest power.
 The praise of the worthiest person.

Philipp against Monsieur.
 Earle of Arundell's letter to the Queen.
 Speeches for my Lord of Essex at the tylt.
 A speech for my Lord of Sussex, tilt.
 Leycester's Commonwealth. Incerto autore.
 Orations at Graie's Inne revells.
 Queene's Mate
 By Mr. ffrauncis Bacon.
 Essaies by the same author.
 Rychard the second.
 Rychard the third.
 Asmund and Cornelia.
 Ile of dogs frmnt.

In addition to this List of Contents, the page has been scribbled over either by some writer "for trial of his pens or for experiments in handwriting." The repetition of the name "*William Shakespeare*," the line from *Lucrece* ("revealing day through every crany peepes"), and the enumeration of *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*, led to the inference that the transcriber was employed upon copying these works of Shakespeare. As, when published, they were obtainable for a few pence, it seems irrational to imagine that anyone would go to the trouble and expense of making manuscript copies of them. If they were not published, how came one of Bacon's secretaries in possession of the MSS.?

In addition to the works of Shakespeare, we find enumerated on this interesting outer cover, *Asmund and Cornelia*, believed to be a lost drama, and "*Ile of Dogs frmnt* (fragment), by *Thomas Nashe inferior plaiers*."

Players, as Dyce states, seldom ventured to approach the houses of the aristocracy, and plays were "hardly regarded as literature." Milton, after mentioning that

men in highest dignity have laboured not a little to be thought able to compose a tragedy, and that Seneca, the philosopher, is by some thought the author of those tragedies that go under another's name, concludes, "this is mentioned to vindicate Tragedy from the small esteem, *or rather infamy*, which in the account of many it undergoes at this day." *

How comes it that we find the infamous works of Shakespeare and other "inferior" dramatists apparently engaging the attention of Francis Bacon?

"GREAT ENGLISHMEN OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY."

THIS is Mr. Lee's latest work, and it shows, better than anything he has yet written, his inveterate animosity to Bacon. He tells us that "An illogical tendency has of late years developed in undisciplined minds to detect in Bacon and Shakespeare a single personality. One has heard of brains which, when subjected to certain excitements, cause their possessors to see double—to see two objects when only one is in view; but it is equally proof of unstable intellectual balance which leads a man or woman to see single—to see one individuality when they are in the presence of two individualities, each definite and distinct. The intellect of both Shakespeare and Bacon may well be termed miraculous. The facts of biography may be unable to account for the emergence of the one or the other, but they can prove convincingly that no two great minds of a single era *pursued literary paths more widely dissevered*. To assume, without an iota of sound evidence, that both Shakespeare's and Bacon's intellect

* Intro. to *Samson Agonistes*.

were (*sic*) housed in a single brain is unreal mockery. *It is an irresponsibly fantastic dream which lies outside the limits of reason.*"

It will be my endeavour to show Mr. Lee, in the course of this article, that he is entirely wrong in promulgating such an argument. It is not the first occasion on which Mr. Lee has described Baconians in similar language. He has varied his expressions in this instance for American consumption, and his variation is as untrue as it is impertinent.

Has Mr. Lee ever read a word of Bacon beyond the *Essays*? According to him there is not the smallest resemblance between Bacon and Shakespeare. He is a Shakspearean, and yet seems singularly unacquainted with the *Commentaries* of Gervinus, of whom Furnivall said:—"What strikes me most in Gervinus is his breadth of culture, his rightness and calmness of judgment, his fairness in looking at both sides of a question, his noble, earnest purpose, his resolve to get at the deepest meaning of his author, and his reverence and love for Shakespeare." And again, "The profound and generous *Commentaries* of Gervinus . . . is still the only book known to me that comes near the true treatment and the dignity of its subject, or can be put into the hands of the student who wants to know the mind of Shakespeare."

Gervinus institutes the following close comparison between Bacon and Shakespeare, contemporaries, in their course of thought, their attitude towards life, and their views of its movements, as revealed in their works:—

"Scarcely can anything be said of Shakespeare's position generally with regard to mediæval poetry which does not also bear upon the position of the renovator, Bacon, with regard to mediæval philosophy. Neither knew nor mentioned the other. . . . Just as Shakespeare went from instance to instance in his judgment

of moral actions, and never founded a law on single experience, so did Bacon in natural science avoid leaping from one experience of the senses to general principles ; he spoke of this with blame, as anticipating nature ; and Shakespeare, in the same way, would have called the conventionalities in the poetry of the southern races an anticipation of human nature. In the scholastic science of the Middle Ages, as in the chivalric poetry of the Romantic period, approbation and not truth was sought for, and with one accord Shakespeare's poetry and Bacon's science were *equally opposed* to this. As Shakespeare balanced the one-sided errors of the imagination by reason, reality, and nature, so Bacon led philosophy away from the one-sided errors of reason to experience ; both, with one stroke, renovated the two branches of science and poetry by this renewed bond with nature ; both, disregarding all by-ways, staked everything upon this 'victory in the race between art and nature.' Just as Bacon, with his new philosophy, is linked with the natural science of Greece and Rome, and then with the latter period of philosophy in western Europe, so Shakespeare's drama stands in relation to the comedies of Plautus, and to the stage of his own day ; between the two lay a vast wilderness of time, as unfruitful for the drama as for philosophy. . . . Bacon felt himself quite an original in that which was his peculiar merit, and so was Shakespeare : the one in the method of science he had laid down, and in his suggestions for its execution, the other in the poetical works he had executed, and in the suggestions of their new law. . . . Shakespeare despised the million, and Bacon feared the applause of the multitude. Both are alike in the rare impartiality with which they avoided everything one-sided. Both have an equal hatred of sects and parties. . . . Both, therefore, are equally free from prejudices, and from astrological superstition in dreams

and omens. . . . From Bacon's example it seems clear that Shakespeare left religious matters unnoticed on the same grounds as himself, and took the path of morality in worldly things; in both, this has been equally misconstrued, and Le Maistre has proved Bacon's lack of Christianity, as Birch has done that of Shakespeare. . . . Neither stooped before authorities, and an injustice similar to that which Bacon committed against Aristotle, Shakespeare perhaps has done to Homer. As Shakespeare was often involuntarily philosophical in his profoundness, Bacon was not seldom surprised into the imagination of the poet. Just as Bacon insisted throughout generally and dispassionately upon the practical use of philosophy, so Shakespeare's poetry aimed throughout at bearing upon the moral life. Bacon himself was of the same opinion; he was not far from declaring history to be the best teacher of politics, and *poetry the best instructor in morals*. Both were alike deeply moved by the picture of a ruling Nemesis, whom they saw, grand and powerful, striding through history and life. . . . In Bacon's works we find a multitude of moral sayings and maxims of experience from which the most striking mottoes might be drawn for every Shakespearean play; aye, for every one of his principal characters . . . testifying to a remarkable harmony in their mutual comprehension of human nature. Both, in their systems of morality rendering homage to Aristotle, whose ethics Shakespeare, from a passage in Troilus, may have read, arrived at the same end as he did—that virtue lies in a just medium between two extremes. Shakespeare would also have agreed with him in this, that Bacon declared excess to be the fault of youth, as defect is of age; he accounted 'defect the worst, because excess contains some sparks of magnanimity, and, like a bird, claims kindred of the heavens, while defect, only like a base worm, crawls upon the earth!'

In these maxims lie at once, as it were, the whole theory of Shakespeare's dramatic forms and of his moral philosophy."

Yet Mr. Sidney Lee declares that there is no affinity between Shakespeare and Bacon !

Kuno Fischer may also give Mr. Lee some further intelligence when he writes:—

"The want of ability to take an historical survey of the world is to be found alike in Bacon and Shakespeare, together with many excellences likewise *common to them both*. . . . Both possessed to an eminent degree that faculty for a knowledge of human nature that at once pre-supposes and calls forth an interest in practical life and historical reality. To this interest corresponds the stage, on which the Roman characters moved ; and here Bacon and Shakespeare met, brought together by a common interest in these objects, and the attempt to depict and copy them. This point of agreement, more than any other argument, explains their affinity. . . . Is not the inexhaustible theme of Shakespeare's poetry the history and course of human passion ? In the treatment of this especial theme is not Shakespeare the greatest of all poets—nay, is he not unique among them all ? *And it is this very theme that is proposed by Bacon as the chief problem of moral philosophy*. . . . Bacon desires nothing less than a natural history of the passions—*the very thing that Shakespeare has produced*. . . . With a few felicitous touches, Bacon sketched the characters of Julius and Augustus Cæsar, *and his view of both was similar to that of Shakespeare*."

Then follows a comparison of the treatment of the character of Cæsar by Bacon and Shakespeare, showing absolute identity in the estimate of his character and actions. Fischer concludes his chapter with this statement ;—

"It is very characteristic that among human passions Bacon best understands avarice and ambition, and least understands love, which he ranks very low. Love was as foreign to his nature as lyrical poetry; but in one single instance he perceived its tragical importance, and this very case was developed by Shakespeare into a tragedy. 'You may observe,' says Bacon, 'that amongst all the great and worthy persons, there is not one that hath transported to the mad degree of love, which shows that great spirits and great business do keep out this weak passion. You must except, nevertheless, Marcus Antonio.' He has already said that love is 'sometimes like a siren, sometimes like a fury,' and it may be truly observed with respect to Cleopatra, as conceived by Shakespeare, that she appears to Mark Antony in both these capacities."

Here, however, with regard to love, Kuno Fischer is wrong, as he judges Bacon's opinion of love solely from his essay *Of Love*. But Bacon's and Shakespeare's ideas on the "tender passion" were exactly similar, and were expressed almost in the same language. Here is one proof of this assertion:—

Bacon, about the year 1592, wrote a device for Essex, called *A Conference of Pleasure*, which has been edited from the "Northumberland House Manuscript" by Spedding, Douse, and Burgoyne. About this same year, Shakespeare wrote his first play, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and I shall give Bacon's ideas of love in parallel columns with those of Shakespeare, extracted from these two works.

SHAKESPEARE (circa 1591-2).

BACON (circa 1591-2).

"Love gives to every power a double power."

"Love gives the mind power to exceed itself."

"Love is first learned in a woman's eyes."

"The eye, where love beginneth."

∞

SHAKESPEARE (circa 1591-2)

—continued.

“Is not love a Hercules?”

“Love . . . with the motion of
all elements.”“But for my love . . . where
nothing wants that want
itself doth seek.”“They here stand martyrs,
slain in Cupid’s wars.”

BACON (circa 1591-2)

—continued.

“What fortune can be such a
Hercules (as love)?” (see
infra).“Love is the motion that ani-
mateth all things.”“When we want nothing, there
is the reason and the
opportunity and the spring
of love.”“Lovers never thought their
profession sufficiently
graced till they had com-
pared it to a warfare.”

For these parallels I am indebted to my friend, Mr. Edwin Reed. Bacon’s *Device*, written fourteen years before his marriage, contains the following significant passages, disproving the statement that “Bacon knew nothing about love”:—

“My praise shall be dedicated to the *happiest state of mind, to the noblest affection*. I shall teach lovers to love, that have all this while loved by rote. I shall give them the alphabet of love.

“Let no man fear the yoke of fortune that’s in the yoke of love. What fortune can be such a Hercules as shall be able to overcome two?”

“Assuredly no person ever saw at any time the mind of another but in love. *Love is the only passion that opens the heart. If not the highest, it is the sweetest affection of all others.*

“When one foreseeeth, withal, that to his many griefs cannot be added solitude, but that he shall have a partner to bear them, this quieteth the mind.”

When Bacon penned these passages in *A Conference of Pleasure* he was unmarried. His *Essay, Of Love*,

was written six years *after* his marriage, so that his bachelor ideas may have experienced a change in the interval, and it is certain that they did.

But Gervinus and Fischer are not the only authorities who bring Bacon and Shakespeare into the same *galère*. Mr. Churton Collins, who detests Baconians and all their ways, has the courage to write :—

“ With *as precise a hand as Bacon*, does he (Shakespeare) sunder the celestial from the terrestrial kingdom, the things of earth from the things of heaven.”

Next we have the testimony of Professor Fowler :—

“ Hence, perhaps, it is that there is no author, unless it be Shakespeare, who is so easily remembered and so frequently quoted (as Bacon).”

While the *Edinburgh Review* once testified :—

“ Bacon is almost Shakespeare in philosophic garb, so resplendent is his *imagination*, and so versatile his genius ” (1854).

Even Professor Masson, who will not have Bacon at any price, declares :—

“ It is as if into a mind poetical in *form* there had been poured all the *matter* that existed in the mind of his (Shakespeare's) contemporary, Bacon. In Shakespeare's plays we have thought, history, exposition, philosophy, all within the round of the poet. The only difference between him and Bacon sometimes is that Bacon writes an essay, and calls it his own, while Shakespeare writes a similar essay, and puts it into the mouth of a Ulysses or a Polonius ” (*Wordsworth and other Essays*, p. 242).

Professor Blackie says :—

“ Bacon's similes, for their aptness and their vivid-

ness, are of the kind of which Shakespeare might have been proud."

Gerald Massey says:—"The philosophical writings of Bacon are suffused and saturated with Shakespeare's thought. . . . These *likenesses in thought and expression* are mainly limited to these two contemporaries. It may also be admitted that one must have copied the other. The fact is reasonably certain, and ought to be treated with courtesy."

In his work entitled *Literary Influence in British History*, the Hon. A. S. G. Canning writes:—

"Bacon, in frequent allusion to classic writers, as well as in cautious avoidance of religious controversy, so prevalent in his time, resembles Shakespeare on this exciting subject. Both these great Englishmen wrote for all religious divisions of their fellow-countrymen, and therefore attack neither 'popery' nor 'heresy.' . . . Like Shakespeare, Bacon had higher objects in view than to increase or maintain the prejudices of fellow-Christians against each other."

In spite of all this, however, there is no resemblance between Bacon and Shakespeare, according to Mr. Sidney Lee. Truly, there is no man so blind as the man who will not see—the man who abuses disbelievers in the theory that the Shakespeare of the plays was the Shaksper of Stratford, who, according to Taine, "lent money, and cut a good figure in this world. Strange close; one which at first sight resembles more that of a shop-keeper than of a poet"—the man of whose life, as it is commonly related, Richard Grant White says:—

"We hunger, and we receive these husks; we open our mouths for *food*, and we break our teeth against these *stones*."

Mr. Lee says:—

"At times he (Bacon) tried to turn a stanza. The results are unworthy of notice. Bacon's acknowledged attempts at formal poetry are uncouth and lumbering; they attest *congenital unfitness* for that mode of expression."

Spedding thought differently when he wrote:—"The heroic couplet could hardly do its work better in the hands of Dryden," and "Bacon had all the natural faculties which a poet wants; a fine ear for metre, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion. Had it taken the ordinary direction, *I have little doubt that it would have carried him to a place among the great poets.*" This is from a man who had read every word that Bacon ever published. Yet Mr. Lee asserts that "The great poet's *faculty of imagination*, which is mainly the fruit of emotion, was denied Bacon." Fancy any sane man denying Bacon the "faculty of imagination!" A certain critic named Macaulay once wrote "The *poetical faculty* was great in Bacon's mind," and "No *imagination* was ever at once so strong, and so thoroughly subjugated." Even Gervinus holds that "Bacon was not seldom surprised into the *imagination of the poet.*"

I would like to enlarge on the other unmitigated nonsense Mr. Lee writes about Bacon in connection with poetry if I had the space; but I afford him some enlightenment on the subject in the March number of *The Fortnightly Review* in a long-delayed article, entitled *Was Bacon a Poet?*

Mr. Lee shows himself lamentably ignorant of Bacon's life when he maintains, "The number of works that Bacon claimed to have penned, when combined with the occupations of his professional career, so filled up every nook and cranny of his adult time that on no showing was leisure available for the conquest of vast fields of poetry and drama." Is Mr. Lee not aware of

the fact that till 1605, the year of the publication of *The Advancement of Learning*, all that Bacon had published, I do not say written, with the exception of a few legal tracts, consisted of ten small essays; that up to 1607, when he became Solicitor-General, he had ample leisure for literary work; that during this period of comparative inactivity five-sixths of the Shakespeare plays had been written and produced; and that none of the dramas were written after Bacon became Attorney-General in 1613, the last being *The Tempest*, ascribed to that year by Tieck as a masque composed to celebrate the marriage of Princess Elizabeth? Why does Mr. Lee not devote a little more attention to the facts and dates of Bacon's life?

As with Bacon's "poetry," Mr. Lee will have nothing to do with Bacon's "scientific research." This is what he says on the subject:—

"It is *doubtful* whether Bacon, despite his *intuitive* grasp of scientific principle, had any *genuine aptitude* for the practical work of *scientific research*."

Mr. Lee is a great believer in "intuition" having provided Shakspeare with all his legal and other knowledge; so we are not surprised to hear that "Bacon's *intuition* enabled him to *strike out* a *few* shrewd scientific *observations* that anticipated researches of the future. He described heat as a mode of motion, and light as requiring time for its transmission; of the atomic theory he had, too, a *shadowy glimpse*. He even *vaguely suggested* some valuable mechanical devices which are now in vogue. In a description of instruments for the transference of sound he foreshadowed the invention of speaking-tubes and telephones; and he died, as we have seen, in an endeavour [a successful endeavour] to test a perfectly accurate theory of refrigeration." How generous this treatment meted out by Mr. Lee to the

founder of the Royal Society! And the Bacon anticipations all were achieved by "intuition!" Bacon also discovered the compressibility of water (anticipating Canton and Oersted), the means of obtaining wires of extreme fineness (anticipating Wollaston), the influence of the moon on the tides, the causes of colour (anticipating Newton), and showed that the motions of the planets are due to the magnetic attraction of the *cælum stellatum*—all, *probably* by "intuition." Bacon, however, I believe, obtained his scientific knowledge by study and experiment. Mr. Lee asserts that both Bacon and Shakspeare got their scientific knowledge by "intuition," which, according to Cowden Clarke, "taught him (Shaksper) many secrets of Nature as yet unpromulgated by science to the world, as well as many of those known only to adepts in their several branches of science;" by "the study of the infinite book of Nature," according to Halliwell-Phillipps; and by "heaven-sent inspiration," according to Sir Theodore Martin. Fancy "intuition" and "heaven-sent inspiration" ever providing a man with the knowledge displayed in the works of Shakespeare! These ideas may suit Mr. Lee's disciples, but they will fail to obtain many supporters among men of science. For a refutation of the opinions of Macaulay and Mr. Lee on Bacon as a scientist, I would refer to my articles in *BACONIANA*, January, 1903, and July, 1904, especially pages 153-4 of the latter communication.

Further comment is unnecessary on Mr. Lee's other perverse opinions of Bacon—of his conduct in "the practical affairs of life," of his extravagance, his "perfidy," his money-borrowing, of his "practice of deceit," of his "tricks and subterfuges, dissimulation, evasion," of his "unparalleled faith in himself," of his "blind self-confidence," of his "breaches of eternal moral laws," etc. Sufficient for the multitude is the

dictum of Mr. Lee that in certain respects "Bacon stands forth as a pitiable failure." Poor Bacon! He never expected to be described as "a pitiable failure."

Contrast this verdict, with that of Bacon's friend, Sir Tobie Matthew:—

"He was a man most sweet in his conversation and ways, grave in his judgments, splendid in his expenses, a friend unalterable to his friends, an enemy to no man, a most hearty indefatigable servant to the king, and a most earnest lover of the public, having all the thoughts of that large heart of his set upon adorning the age in which he lived, and benefiting as far as possible the whole human race. It is not his greatness that I admire, but his virtue; it is not the favours I have received from him, infinite though they be, that have thus enthralled and enchained my heart; but his whole life and character, which are such that, if he were of an inferior condition, I could not honour him the less, and if he were my enemy, I could not the less love and endeavour to serve him."

This is the true Bacon, though not the Bacon of Mr. Sidney Lee, who in his latest effort has fairly outdone Macaulay in his virulence.

Mr. Lee's chapters on *Shakespeare's Career* and *Foreign Influences on Shakespeare* are reserved for future criticism in BACONIANA. Meanwhile, let Mr. Lee look up his copy of *Gervinus*.

GEORGE STRONACH.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

Spedding's Sonnet.

A CORRESPONDENT draws our attention to the following interesting passages from the *Autobiography* of Henry Taylor, pp. 236—238 :—

“In Spedding, who seemed to us in the Colonial Office the most mild and imperturbable of men, the detractors of Lord Bacon had awakened a passion of indignation the capability for which even those who knew him more than superficially could scarcely have believed to be lying hidden in his heart. In the course of a search amongst old papers, I have come upon a sonnet and a letter, in which the passion finds a language to express itself both in prose and verse. The letter speaks of the sonnet :—‘It sprang out of a very strong emotion that used to visit me from time to time, and from the occasional agitation of which I am not yet secure. And the emotion is roused as often as I consider what kind of creatures they are who so complacently take it for granted that they are nobler beings than Bacon—being, as I believe, the beggarliest souls that have been gifted with the faculty of expressing themselves—insomuch that if the administration of the divine judgments were deputed to me for half an hour, I think I would employ it in making the scales fall from their eyes, and letting them see and understand Bacon as he was, and themselves as they are. The contemplation of the two for half an hour would at least leave them speechless. My only doubt is whether any power whatever could enable them to understand either his greatness or their own littleness without making them over again quite new, which would be more trouble than

they are worth. Well, then, if this is what ought to be done, why is it not done? Why are these people permitted to go on strutting and moralising and making the angels weep, when a sudden gift of insight into themselves would make them go and hide out of the way? I can think of no likelier reason than that Bacon himself would be sorry that any of those who were once his fellow-creatures should suffer such a punishment on his account. And it was to relieve myself from the pressure of this thought (which, as you may see, is apt to put me out of my proprieties) by shutting it up in a sonnet that I began. . . .'

"And then he proceeds to say how he conceives that he had ended in a failure. But the truth is that from beginning to end the sonnet is one of Miltonic force and fervour, and here it is:

'When I have heard sleek worldlings quote thy name
And sigh o'er great parts gone in evil ways,
And thank the God they serve on Sabbath days
That they are not as thou, meek Verulam,
Then have I marvelled that the searching flame
Lingered in God's uplifted hand, which lays
The filmed bosom bare to its own gaze
And makes men die with horror of their shame :
But when I thought how humbly thou didst walk
On earth,—how kiss that merciless rod,—I said
Surely 'twas thy prevailing voice that prayed
For patience with those men and their rash talk,
Because they knew thy deeds but not thy heart,
And who knows partly can but judge in part.'"

Current Literature

THE March Number of the *Fortnightly Review* contains an article from the pen of Mr. George Stronach, entitled: "Was Bacon a Poet?" In the *New Ireland Review* (March) the Rev. W. A. Sutton has a paper on "Bacon and Modern Language Bankruptcy."

The Shakespeare Memorial

THE conflict of ideas as to the form which this should take seems to be considerably hampering the Committee. The *Morning Post* of March 10th has the following note on the subject:—

“There is one way of celebrating the fame of Shakespeare which commends itself to a few of his admirers. It is the appointment of a Royal Commission or other properly constituted tribunal to dispose once and for all of the Baconian heresy. If, for instance, Mr. George Stronach were appointed to lay the case for Bacon before such a tribunal and Mr. Sidney Lee was appointed to reply to it, each side producing its evidence, and no evidence being admitted which would not be allowed in a court of law, and if the commissioners were as impartial and well qualified as those who sat in the Parnell and Beck inquiries, the recurring attempt to prove that the author of the *Novum Organum* and of certain metrical versions of psalms also wrote the love scenes in *Romeo and Juliet*, the woodland scenes of *As You Like It*, and the rest of Shakespeare, might be for ever avoided. It is merely a suggestion.”


“BA with a Horn Added”

DR. PLATT has some interesting papers in the *American Conservator*, from one of which we quote:—

“Page [*Moth*] What is Ab speld backward with the horn on his head?

“Pedagogue [*Holofernes*] Ba, *puericia* with a horne added.

“Page [*Moth*] Ba most seely Sheepe, with a horne : you heare his learning.

“Holofernes’ reply does not seem to be a very satisfactory answer to the conundrum, and I doubt if I should have guessed it if the hint had not been dropped in a letter which was sent to me by my friend, the late Dr. Bucke, from Mr. A. Anscombe, suggesting that the horn might refer to some mark of abbreviation. I take this occasion to thank Mr. Anscombe—never having had opportunity of doing so before—for his very suggestive hint, for I soon found that a horn-shaped mark at the beginning of a word—on the head—in Elizabethan writing and printing, stood for the syllable *con*; thus *conclave*=conclave. Any dictionary of printing will verify this statement. Then Ab with the horn on its head is *cab* and backward it is, as I have shown in ‘New Shakespeareana,’ *ba* =Bacon. “Coincidences” seem to be galling one another’s kibes.”

A Find

IN the house of a country woman in Sweden a copy of the 1594 quarto edition of *Titus Andronicus* has recently come to light. This was the first edition. It was known to have been published, but no extant copy was believed to be in existence.

Ben Jonson

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I FIND authority for Ben Jonson doing translating for Bacon in Tenison's Introduction to BACONIANA, p. 60, but I want to know if he was actually a member of Bacon's household. In Spedding's "Letters and Life," Vol. VI, p. 336, there is a list of the household in 1618, and "Mr. Johnson" is in it as "Chief Gentleman Usher." Could that be Ben? I do not know exactly what the functions of a "Chief Gentleman Usher" would be, but I suppose if Bacon wanted a man near him for confidential work that designation would be as good as any other. In the same volume, p. 328, there is an account of Bacon's receipts and disbursements from June 24th to September 29th, 1618, including this item: "July 27th, to Mr. Johnson by your Lp order for his son, and his son's tutor at Eton, £4 8s od." Did Ben have a son at Eton in 1618? He had a son, born probably about 1603-6.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

The Problem of the Shakespeare Plays

MR. BOMPAS will be glad to present a copy of this book to those Members and Associates of the Bacon Society who do not already possess it.

The Noted Weed

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I HAVE been reading the new work of Judge J. H. Stotsenburg, entitled "An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title" (516 pp., 1904. J. P. Morton & Co., Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A.). While perusing the so-called Shakespeare sonnet 76, which is copied in that book, I came to line 7, which reads: "That every word doth almost tell my name," and concluded that I would try and see if I

could find the name of some writer of that period. In a very short time I discovered the name of "Bacon," but I do not succeed in finding the name of Shake-speare, or Shagsper, or Sidney, or Raleigh, or the name of any other person who has been suggested as the author of the sonnets.

I quote the first eight lines of sonnet 76. The cypher letters are printed in capitals.

"Why is my verse so Barren of new pride,
 So far from variation or quick change?
 Why, with the time, do I not glance Aside
 To new-found methods and to Compounds strange?
 Why write I still all One, ever the same,
 And keep invention in a Noted weed
 That every word doth almost tell my name,
 Showing their Birth, AND where they did prOCeed?"

The cipher used by Bacon in the above was a very simple one, being a kind of an acrostic. In this cipher Bacon makes *three* the basis of the cipher; the first letter "b" begins the *sixth* (a multiple of *three*) word, the next letter "a" is in the third line, and is the first letter of the *ninth* (again a multiple of *three*) word; the following letters, "c," "o," "n," are each the first letter of the *sixth* word in their respective lines. In the fourth line, Bacon compounded the word "new-found," so as to make the "c" appear in its correct place as the first letter of the *sixth* word of that line. In the eighth line the name is again found; in that line one half of the cipher word is found by reading from left to right, and the balance by reading from right to left, similar to portions of some of Bacon's ciphers which are explained in some of his later works.

I would call the attention of the readers of *BACONIANA* to this book by Judge Stotsenburg; it completes the argument commenced by W. H. Edwards in his excellent work, "Shaksper not Shakespeare" (507 pp., 1900. R. Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.), who proved conclusively that Wm. Shaksper (1564-1616), or Shagsper (as his name ought always to be written and spelled by all Baconians, for it was so spelled in the marriage bond of November, 1582, practically the earliest and most authentic written mention of his name), of Stratford, could not write. Mr. Edwards concludes his part of the argument, which was to thoroughly prove that Wm. Shagsper did not and could not write the plays, poems, sonnets, etc., that were written between 1579 and 1623, and that appeared under the name of Will Shake-speare; Mr. Stotsenburg continues the argument by suggesting the origin of the plays, and to what extent Bacon improved and added to them.

R. A. SMITH.

War Department, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., February 4, 1905.

Mr. Pitt-Lewis's "Outline"

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I have read with interest the article in *BACONIANA* for January last on the above subject. May I be allowed to supplement it by asking a few questions and offering some further criticism?

(1) Mr. Pitt-Lewis (p. 78) says that the *Return from Parnassus* was originally written in Greek by Jonson; that this play was performed at Cambridge in December, 1601, and "translated out of the Greek into plain English" in 1616. May I ask on what evidence Mr. Pitt-Lewis bases this statement? It is strange indeed that neither Professor Arber nor Mr. Macray mention the Greek original or the Jonsonian authorship!

(2) At page 47, Mr. Pitt-Lewis tells us that Jonson had been a member of Cambridge University. Jonson held an honorary degree at that University, but that he was never there as a student can, I think, be clearly proved.

(3) Where is "Capell College, Cambridge," which is said to possess the anonymous 1591 edition of *King John* (p. 37)?

(4) At page 29, Mr. Pitt-Lewis speaks of the "Mousetrap incident, in which, under pretence of seeking for a mouse behind the tapestry, Hamlet runs his sword through the man concealed there"; whereas it is, of course, the Play of Act III. which is "the Mouse-trap," and it is "a rat" which Hamlet afterwards pretends to stab behind the arras.

(5) At page 52, Mr. Pitt-Lewis repeats Judge Webb's unfortunate mistake about the "noted weed." A glance at the context is sufficient to show that this cannot bear the suggested meaning.

(6) At page 36, Mr. Pitt-Lewis writes, "The subject matter of *Venus and Adonis* was to advise a rich and amorous young lord, in terms of familiar freedom, to marry and beget an heir." The writer, surely, meant to allude not to *Venus and Adonis*, but to the "Procreation Sonnets."

(7) On the same page (36), Mr. Pitt-Lewis tells us of the head-piece to the First Folio, which contained an etching that "depicted a man behind a mask throwing a 'spear' at Ignorance. I can find no such man behind a mask in the Folio headpiece.

I submit the above queries and criticism (and more might be added) in no unfriendly spirit, but in the cause of that accuracy which (as the article referred to well says) "is the life-breath of the enquiry upon which we are engaged."

Yours faithfully, CANTAB.

P.S.—On reflection, I presume "Capell College, Cambridge," is a mistake for "The Capell Collection in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Your correspondent "Cantab" has, I think, quite overlooked the object of my little "Outline." This merely seeks to set out, in a very small space, the details of what will appear in full in a large and more serious work which I am contemplating.

1. My larger book will give reference to the exact pages of the learned and most classical writer which appear to me to contain the authority I rely upon.

2. Ben Jonson was, beyond question, a very excellent classical scholar, and he, as undoubtedly, had the degrees both of Cambridge, his own *alma mater*, and of Oxford also—the latter doubtless as a compliment to his vast and well-known learning. The knowledge of the college he was a member of in Cambridge University is perfectly well-known; and so it also is how Jonson got there, and when and why he was taken away from the University. I, therefore, cannot accept "Cantab's" rather dogmatic assumption that Jonson was "never there a student." I will cite the very old authorities to the contrary in my forthcoming book when produced.

3. If "Cantab" turns to page lxxviii. of Judge Willis's published *Lecture*—the price of which is only two shillings—he will there find the information he wishes as to "Capell College." This college, I may add, is not so called now.

4. The history of the "Mousetrap" scene in *Hamlet* requires too much explanation to set out here. In this case I trust "Cantab" will be patient, and await my larger book to learn at detail.

5. "Cantab" appears quite assured on the point named. Therefore, pages of argument would fail to convince him. If he cares to read this question he can find the attack on Judge Webb in the *National Review* for July, 1892; and the Judge's reply in the following number of the *Review*.

6. If "Cantab" will permit it, I shall still prefer to refer to *Venus and Adonis*. This subject is more conveniently discussed in my larger book than argued here at the length it will require given to it.

7. The larger book, when subscribed to, will give the reference "Cantab" would like.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

G. PITT-LEWIS.

The Bacon Society (Incorporated)

At the Annual General Meeting of the Bacon Society, held at Hart Street, Bloomsbury, on February 6th, 1905, the President, Mr. Francis Fearon, in the chair, the following officers were elected :—

President: Mr. G. C. Bompas. *Vice-President*: Mr. Granville C. Cunningham. *Council*: Mr. W. T. Smedley, Mr. A. P. Sinnett, Mr. Parker Woodward, Mr. Fleming Fulcher. *Hon. Treasurer*: Mr. Francis Fearon. *Hon. Secretary*: Mr. Harold Bayley.

The Society has made arrangements for a series of drawing-room meetings, the first of which will be held on March 29th, at the house of Mr. Granville C. Cunningham.

At the Sesame Club, on March 8th, Mr. A. P. Sinnett gave an address to a crowded audience in favour of the proposition that the weight of evidence is in favour of Francis Bacon being the author of the Shakespeare plays. Miss Beatrice Forbes Robertson read a paper in support of the Shakespearean authorship.

The Biliteral Cipher

As BACONIANA claims to keep its readers "abreast with the latest aspects of the controversy" (January, 1905, p. 67), may I enquire of the Editor, or some responsible correspondent, what is the present attitude of that Magazine to the charge of plagiarism from Pope, brought by Mr. Marston against Mrs. Gallup. This charge of plagiarism has nothing to do with the cipher in *Henry VII.*, which a Committee is understood to be dealing with, and I cannot in my present unenlightened state reconcile the claim above made (p. 67) with the absolute suppression of all mention of so crucial a question for some three years or so!

W. THEOBALD.

Ilfracombe, January, 1905.

[In the following issue we hope to publish the results of the Bacon Society's investigations.—ED. BACONIANA.]

Bacon Weed

THERE is a plant mentioned in Funk's Dictionary, which reminds me of Shakespeare's line:—

"Why write I still, all one, ever the same
And keep invention in a noted weed
Shewing their birth, and where they did proceed?"

It is called the *Bacon Weed*. Its provincial name is *Pig-weed*, and its Latin name is *Chirapodium Album*. Is it a kind of grass? Spear grass? Will any botanist tell me?

A. A. L.